Rhodora

[SEPTEMBER

CONNECTICUT: Hartland, Weatherby, no. 3494. NEW YORK: Bonaparte Swamp, Lewis Co., House, no. 6278; Canton, O. P. Phelps, no. 168; Utica, Gray, N. Am. Gram. Cyp., no. 113; Arkville, Agnes Chase, Am. Grasses, no. 631; Wayland, Wiegand, no. 15,209; Savannah, F. P. Metcalf, no. 5598; Cortland, Eames & MacDaniels, no. 3499.

PENNSYLVANIA: Elkdale, Fogg, no. 12,196; Elmhurst, Glowenke, no. 5896; Moscow, Glowenke, no. 7843; Pavia, Berkheimer, no. 2517; Brockway, Wahl, no. 2287 (leaves 2 cm. broad); Morris, Fogg, no. 16,096. WEST VIRGINIA: Canaan Valley, Tucker Co., Allard, no. 6880. ONTARIO: Niagara, June 6, 1891, J. Macoun; Galt, Montgomery, no. 1085; Stokes Bay, Krotkov, no. 8703; Sault Ste. Marie, F. J. Hermann, no. 7261; Batchawana, Algoma Distr., Taylor et al., no. 1084. MICHIGAN: Port Huron, C. K. Dodge, no. 39; Tecumseh, Folwell, no. 99; Ann Arbor, June 8, 1898, Burnham; Lansing, June 7, 1886, L. H. Bailey; Gogebic Lake, Pease & Bean, no. 26,468; West Bluff, Keweenaw Co., Fernald & Pease, no. 3086. Оню: Braceville Twp., Trumbull Co., June 9, 1907, Webb & Rood: Nelson Ledge, Portage Co., Webb, no. 923. WISCONSIN: Granite Heights, Cheney, no. 3107; Mole Lake, Forest Co., E. J. Palmer, no. 27,747; Racine, June 21, 1881, J. J. Davis.

ILLINOIS: Elgin, 1863, Vasey.

222

GALIUM HARCYNICUM: A PROBLEM IN INTER-PRETING THE INTERNATIONAL RULES

M. L. FERNALD

RECENT European taxonomists agree that this species of western, central and northern Europe (northwest to Iceland) and southeastern Newfoundland, which has often passed as *Galium* saxatile L. Sp. Pl. i. 106 (1753), is not that species "Habitat in Hispaniae maritimis lapidosis". Unfortunately, in first recording this "HEATH-BEDSTRAW" as a native of the rocky barrens of southeastern Newfoundland, in RHODORA, xxviii. 83 and 236 (1926), I accepted for the plant the name of Linnaeus (1753), not realizing, as recent Europeans assert, that G. saxatile sensu many authors, not L. (1753), should be called G. harcynicum Weigel, Obs. 25 (1772) or as most of them, including many who claim to follow the International Rules, insist on writing it G. hercynicum, the spelling which Weigel did not use.

1950] Fernald,—Galium harcynicum 223

As to the spelling of the specific name, the current European practice, starting perhaps with DC. Prodr. iv. 598 (1830), departs from Weigel's original and only spelling "harcynicum". Weigel, naming the species Galium harcynicum, cited the Galium caule decumbente, etc. of Haller, Hist. Stirp. Helvet., no. 717 (1768). Haller's plant grew "In sylva Hercynia", "Hercynia silva" being the classical name of the great forest extending from the Schwarzwald to the Harz Mountains. In composing his specific name Galium harcynicum Weigel, unhappily, gave a Germanic rather than a clssical form to it. In 1805, two of the most scholarly of botanists, Lamarck and DeCandolle, Fl. Fr. ed. 3, iv. 261 (1805) accepted, without indication of etymological protest, and described in detail as their no. 3376: "Gaillet du Hartz. Galium Harcynicum'. At the same period other learned botanists, such as Gmelin, Fl. Baden. i. 338 (1805), unequivocally called the plant by its original binomial. It was later than that that the change to G. hercynicum was made. This is indicated in Index Kewensis where one finds the following entries under Galium, though with the misidentification which others had made: harcynicum, Weigel, Obs. 25, sphalm. vide =

hercynicum. hercynicum, Weigel, l. c. 25 = saxatile.

The assertion that Weigel's perhaps unfortunate spelling was an orthographic or typographic lapse is only an assumption. So long as botanical nomenclature was what has been called a "personal-preference, hit-or-miss" matter, authors changed at will the original spellings. Now, however, we have the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. Article 70 says:

The original spelling of a name or epithet must be retained, except in the case of a typographic error, or of a clearly unintentional orthographic error . . .

Note 1. The words "original spelling" in this Article mean the spelling employed when the name was validly published . . .

Then as examples of retention of original spelling are the following: "Mesembryanthemum L. (1753) and Amaranthus L. (1753) . . . must not be altered to Mesembrianthemum and Amarantus respectively, although these latter forms are philologically preferable. Valantia L. (1753) and Clutia L. (1753), commemorating Vaillant and Cluyt respectively, must not be altered to Vaillantia and Cluytia". So far as I can see the

F

224

Rhodora

[SEPTEMBER

original specific epithet harcynicum, accepted by Lamarck & DeCandolle and many others as a valid name, "must not be altered to" hercynicum, "although" this latter form is "philologically preferable". If this case is not exactly parallel with those cited in the International Rules, as it seems to be, then the latter need clarification. If this and other "Doubtful cases should be referred to the Executive Committee", as the Rules direct, they will, judging from past experience, apparently get no consideration whatever and "personal preference" will again prevail! As to the difference between the retention of the original spelling and the rejection of a name as originally published, the editors of the International Rules were as inconsistent as possible. Among the "Examples of unintentional orthographic errors" one finds: "Libertia Laurencei Hook. f. (Fl. Tasman. II. 34: 1860) being an orthographic error for L. Lawrencei Hook. f. (l. c. 373, t. 129), the latter spelling should be adopted: the collector's name was Lawrence, not Laurence." The original and philologically correct Laurencei given with the Latin description, "the spelling employed when the name was validly published", must by this interpretation be thrown out because in a list of Additions (p. 373) and in the caption of the plate it was given the philologically incorrect form Lawrencii. Bentham, a scholar like Hooker fil., in his Fl. Austral. vi. 414 (1873) used the original (but, by the interpretation of the International Rules, incorrect) L. Laurencei and Index Kewensis, iii. 76 (1894), "COMPILED . . . UNDER THE DIRECTION OF JOSEPH D. HOOKER (names there published cited as of "Hook. fil. & Jackson"), has only L. Laurencei. The species was "validly published", with a philologically correct name and that name was consistently used in subsequent writings of the author's intimate and scholarly associates or under his sponsorship. Therefore, by the interpretation of the editors of the International Rules, that name, which was correctly spelled (as a Latin name) in the original description must be excluded as an "unintentional orthographic error" because the plant was discovered by Lawrence (not Laurence). Valantia and Clutia (for Vaillant and Cluyt) must stand because Linnaeus incorrectly Latinized the names of those scientists! "Consistency, thou art a jewel!"